

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-33 have been rejected.

Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include a computer readable storage medium. Accordingly, Applicants assert that these claims clearly recite statutory subject matter and respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The basis of the §112 rejection appears to be that claim 1 “only recites a software and no structural element was claimed.” Office Action, p. 3. Accordingly, given that amended claim 1 now clearly recites a structural element, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-4, 6, and 10-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0153739 naming inventors Trimmer et al. (“Trimmer ‘39”), which incorporates by reference U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0034811 naming inventors Trimmer et al. (“Trimmer ‘11”), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0078639 naming inventors Anna et al. (“Anna”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With respect to claim 1, the cited art fails to teach or suggest a virtual device interface that is configured to allow a primary storage device to be accessed using at least one operation that is substantially the same as that used to control a secondary storage device, where the virtual device interface is also coupled to control both said primary storage device and said secondary storage device.

The Office Action relies upon Trimmer '39 to teach the above-quoted features of claim 1. Office Action, p. 4. Trimmer '39 describes a system in which data originating in a computer network 56 (this network is erroneously described as "host computer #56" on page 4 of the Office Action) can be backed up to a virtual tape library (VTL) 52 by a data protection application (DPA) 60. Trimmer '39, paragraph 30. The DPA is not aware that the VTL is not an actual physical tape library (PTL); accordingly, the DPA writes data to the VTL in "exactly the same format as if the DPA 60 was writing the data to tape." *Id.*

An emulator within the VTL "translates the relevant DPA commands to the format of the VTL so that the commands sent by the DPA may be carried out by the VTL." U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0111251 naming inventors Trimmer et al. (Trimmer '51), paragraph 24. Accordingly, the disclosure in Trimmer '51 (which is part of Trimmer '39 by operation of the incorporation by reference set forth in paragraph 10 of Trimmer '39) makes it clear that the VTL cannot understand the commands generated by the DPA without the assistance of the emulator.

In the Trimmer references (Trimmer '39 and Trimmer '51), no single component is coupled to control both a primary storage device (which includes non-removable storage media) and a secondary storage device (which includes removable storage media). As shown above, it is the emulator within the VTL (as described in Trimmer '51) that allows the VTL to be accessed in the same manner as a PTL, and this emulator is clearly never shown or described as being "coupled to control" a PTL in addition to a VTL. Accordingly, Trimmer's emulator clearly neither teaches nor suggests the virtual device interface of claim 1.

None of the other components of Trimmer's system both provide the functionality of a virtual device interface and are coupled to control both a primary and secondary storage device. Accordingly, the other cited portions of Trimmer, both alone and in combination with the portions of Trimmer that describe the emulator, also fail to teach or suggest the virtual device interface of claim 1.

The Examiner relies upon paragraph 15 of Trimmer '39 as the basis for the assertion that "the virtual tape library system capable of electronically copy data [sic], for example, to local disk storage #54 and to remote off site physical tape library." Office Action, p. 4. This assertion appears to be the basis for asserting that Trimmer '39 teaches

“said virtual device interface is coupled to control said primary storage device and said secondary storage device.” Office Action, p. 4.

Paragraph 15 of Trimmer 39 fails to teach or suggest a virtual device interface configured and coupled in the manner recited in claim 1. Paragraph 15 of Trimmer merely states that “data in one VTL may be electronically copied or otherwise copied to another remotely located VTL or VTLs.” This fails to teach or suggest a secondary storage device (which, as noted above, includes removable storage media) or a virtual device interface that is coupled to control both a primary and a secondary storage device. The mere fact that data “may be electronically copied” between VTLs provides no teaching or suggestion as to what component of Trimmer’s system is controlling that copying activity, nor does it teach or suggest any control of or coupling to a secondary storage device, since Trimmer’s VTLs all include non-removable storage media and can thus only be properly equated with the primary storage device of claim 1.

Other portions of Trimmer ’39 and ’51 that describe copying data to a PTL do not describe such copying being initialized by a device that performs the functionality of a virtual device interface. For example, paragraph 14 of Trimmer ’51 describes how the write operations made by the DPA to the VTL can be kept in a log and how physical tapes can then be created by playing back the log. However, such portions of the Trimmer references are completely silent as to which component performs such playback or as to whether such a component would be “coupled to control” both a primary and secondary storage device. Thus, these portions of Trimmer also fail to teach or suggest the virtual device interface of claim 1, which is coupled to control both primary and secondary storage devices.

As noted above, the Trimmer references also fail to teach or suggest that Trimmer’s emulator be coupled to control a secondary storage device. The emulator is the component within Trimmer’s system that allows a VTL to be accessed as if the VTL was a PTL. In Trimmer ’51, the emulator is clearly shown as being part of the VTL, and no teaching or suggestion is provided in any of the Trimmer references that the emulator be coupled to control a PTL or other secondary storage device. Thus, Trimmer’s emulator clearly cannot be equated with the virtual device interface of claim 1. Furthermore, since the emulator is the only component within Trimmer’s system that allows a VTL to be accessed as a PTL (the DPA simply interacts with the VTL as if the

VTL were a PTL, and thus, absent the emulator, the DPA could not interact with the VTL properly), no other component of Trimmer's system can be equated with the virtual device interface of claim 1.

Anna, which is not relied upon to teach any portion of the "virtual device interface" of claim 1, also fails to teach or suggest the above-described features. For at least the foregoing reasons, the cited art fails to teach or suggest claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-4 and 6. Claims 10-33 are patentable over the cited art for similar reasons.

Claims 5 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Trimmer '39, which incorporates by reference Trimmer '11, in view of Anna and Trimmer '51. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 5 recites that the virtual tape interface is configured to create a virtual loader on the primary storage device. None of the cited art teaches or suggests creating a virtual loader on the same storage device that the virtual device interface is allowing to be accessed. The cited portions of the Trimmer references merely describe how the VTL can include an emulator and the sort of functionality that can be implemented by that emulator. However, the emulator is clearly shown (in FIG. 2 of Trimmer '51) as being separate from the actual storage media in the VTL. No portion of any of Anna or the Trimmer references teaches or suggests storing the emulator (or any other module that could be equated with the virtual loader of claim 5) on a primary storage device. Accordingly, the cited art quite clearly fails to teach or suggest claim 5.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5087.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,



Brenna A. Brock  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 48,509  
(512) 439-5087 [Phone]  
(512) 439-5099 [Fax]